DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 128 782 CS 002 948

AUTHOR Palmatier, Robert A., Ed.
TITLE [Reading Teacher Education.]
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 33p.
JOURNAL CIT Epistle; v3 n3 Entire Issue Jul 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Doctoral Programs; Higher Education; *Reading; Reading Instruction; State Legislation; State Standards; *Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

This issue of "Epistle," the publication forum of Professors of Reading Teacher Educators, contains three papers as well as the regular features on job openings and on miscellaneous facts. Titles and authors of the articles are: "Doctoral Education in Reading: The State of the Art," by Richard Allington; "The Virtues of Being a Toad and What That Has to Do with Doctoral Programs in Reading," by Kemble Oliver; and "Highlights of Legislative and Certification Changes in Eighteen States: Another Eighteen States Report," by Kemble Oliver. (JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED128782

Vol. 3, No. 3 July 1976

EPISTLE

The Publication Forum of
Professors of Reading Teacher Educators
A Special Interest Group of the
International Reading Association

Contents

Doctoral Education in Reading: The State of the Art
Richard Allington

The virtues of being a toad and what that has to do with doctoral programs in reading
Kemble Oliver

Highlights of Legislative and Certification Changes in Eighteen States: Another 18 States Report
Kemble Oliver

Regular Features

JOB REPORT

FOR THE TIME CAPSULE

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

CS 002 948

EPISTLE

Athens, Georgia
July, 1976

Dear Colleagues:

The meeting at Anaheim marked the beginning of the fourth year of our Special Interest Group, the Professors of Reading Teacher Educators. The Anaheim meeting emphasized once again that university professors are not the only individuals concerned with the status of advanced training programs in reading education. Our program included school district administrative personnel, consultants with state education agencies, and graduate students in training, together with university professors of reading education. The program was designed to promote an exchange of ideas and viewpoints from different interest groups, each concerned with ways in which the preparation of reading educators might be improved. Our lead article by Richard Allington, the moderator for the program, synthesizes the results of that meeting.

Kemble Oliver, ending a one-year stint as Assistant Editor with EPISTLE, is responsible for two articles in this issue. Our second article, "The Virtues of Being a Toad and What That Has to Do with Doctoral Programs in Reading," is included at the suggestion of Richard Allington. It is the text of his position paper on what graduate students want, presented at the Anaheim meeting. The third article is a sequel to an earlier article (EPISTLE 3 (1)) and summarizes certification and legislative changes which will affect reading in a second group of eighteen states, bringing the total group of states to thirty-six.

Like our last issue, this issue includes a large selection of jobs available in reading education. Although it would seem that the season for advertising jobs would be largely over, the announcements of openings have continued to arrive at a steady rate over the last three months.

A few items from the Time Capsule conclude this issue.

PRTE and EPISTLE continue to receive numerous expressions of support from members and friends, but there has been a virtual dearth of articles submitted for publication. We have been promised a number of articles for the next issue, but none have been forthcoming. Without articles, publication of EPISTLE cannot continue. This next year will therefore be viewed as an accountability stage for the publication. If the condition does not improve considerably for the next issues, I will propose an end to EPISTLE or a reduction in the number of issues.

Either course of action seems illogical. There are a number of concerns for which EPISTLE offers the only forum, concerns which might be addressed by professors, graduate students, or public school personnel. Take time to draft a brief article on the problems you see as legitimate concerns for improving the training of specialists in reading. Keep in mind that changes in methods of certification, or the requirement of additional courses for certification in non-reading courses may affect what students are able to include in their graduate preparation. Instructional materials, assessment procedures, popularization of instructional methodologies, and even the publication of standardized test data may have as great an effect on graduate training programs as budget fluctuation. Note, for example, that the rumor mill is suggesting that next year's ESAA funding will not include reading as an area of concern. Think about it . . . and write your thoughts, fears, suggestions, and so forth, in article format and send it to us.

Membership remains high; however, we can still use many more members. Perhaps you could acquaint your graduate students with EPISTLE when they arrive on campus in the fall. As consumers they should be interested in this forum as a place where their concerns might find audience.

Best,

Bob

Robert A. Palmatier
Chairman, PRTE

OUR APOLOGIES: The references to Dr. Joan Nelson's article, "Speculations on the Management of Retrenchment in Education," which appeared in the last issue of EPISTLE, were inadvertently omitted when we went to press. They are listed below. Our apologies to Dr. Nelson and to our readers.

1. Kenneth E. Boulding. The management of decline. Change, June, 1975.

2. Joan Nelson. Supervising the evaluation of competencies, in Reading Rx: Better Teachers, Better Supervisors, Better Programs (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1975).

3. Robert A. Palmatier. Must everyone work in teacher education?. EPISTLE, 2 (3), 1975.

Doctoral Education in Reading: The State of the Art

Richard Allington*
State University of New York at Albany

The recent surge of interest in advanced study of the reading processes has been greeted positively by reading educators. However, there is concern about the rapid proliferation of programs that centers on two issues; 1) what are appropriate courses of study for persons pursuing this advanced study? and, 2) now effective are the programs now available?

These questions are difficult to answer for several reasons. First, persons pursuing advanced study of reading processes are preparing themselves for a variety of professional careers. Thus it seems no single comprehensive program of study could (or should) be developed to meet the professional goals and aspirations of those who would pursue the advanced study of reading. Second, probably no program has (or will have) the resources to meet all of these various needs. Thus program effectiveness may have to be more narrowly evaluated, based more upon individual program goals than any wide-ranging set of criteria.

The current state of the art was discussed by a variety of "consumers" representing what was perceived as different professional roles. The four roles were University professor, public school administrative personnel, state education department representative, and graduate students enrolled in advanced study of reading processes (the participants are listed at the end of this paper). This symposium provided some evaluative insights which may assist in the strengthening of advanced courses of study. Each of the "consumers" seemed to view current programs in terms of different strengths and weaknesses. In the remainder of this paper the state of the art as represented by each of the "consumers" is presented.

From the University View: Advanced programs seem to suffer from a basic weakness which might best be described as a lack of emphasis on actual training for the varied roles university professors are expected

---

*At the recent IRA annual meeting in Anaheim, the Professor of Reading Teacher Education sponsored a forum addressing current issues in doctoral education in reading. This paper is an attempt to draw together many of the diverse opinions expressed by the speakers. As with any attempt of this sort, however, the points of view expressed herein must be attributed to the author.

to fill. Traditionally, the university has had tripartite functions: research, teaching, and service. Evaluation was based on the combination of these activities.

A first area for disucssion is research training. Because this is becoming the increasingly dominant criteria for evaluation, programs might first seek to strengthen the applied, or integrative aspects of these skills. In other words, programs should ensure not only that graduates have completed appropriate coursework in research design, statistics, etc., but also that following this sequence they have been involved in a practicum that allows for the integration, or application of this knowledge. Far too many programs consider the dissertation research both the practicum experience and the terminal behavior. Too often the student is left to draw the inference alone, or to arrange through independent initiative an informal liason with a professor interested in similar research topics.

To strengthen current programs two factors need to be considered: 1) Does the course of study contain sufficient opportunities for the student to acquire the knowledge necessary for the development of high quality research? and 2) Does the program have a component, a practicum or internship for instance, that assists in the integration of the theoretical knowledge into practice?

The second function of a University professor is teacher training. Unlike the research component, which often has at least a minimum required sequence of courses, most programs seem not to have a well developed course of study for preparing graduates as teacher trainers. Little emphasis seems to be given to either planned study or experiences concerned with the preparation and delivery of pre-service education. Though many programs allow, or require, experience as teaching assistants, seldom are these experiences supplemented with coursework or readings on instructional design. Skills such as design and implementation of field-centered, competency-based education, for instance, are required in many professional positions available in teacher training. Other skills or abilities required universally are the design of courses of study, the design of assessment instruments, advisement, etc. Few programs seem to offer structured learning experiences in these important facets of professional preparation. Students may learn from their faculty models, but little formative evaluation of the advanced students repertoire of skills in these areas seem evident.

Thus, to strengthen existing programs one might evaluate both whether students are presented with theoretical models of instruction and instructional design and further whether planned experiences, complete with formative evaluations, are available.

The final function is global. Service entails activities as varied as speaking to groups after dinner, committee service both within the University and outside, professional organization work, etc. Virtually

no programs prepare students to deal with the political aspects of professorship and similar program deficiencies exist in each of the other activities that fall under the broad label of service. Active involvement as student members of University committees, or in professional organizations may ease the transition from student to faculty status, but the "real world" or professorship can come only after the transition has been made. Program design must present the student with abundant opportunities to engage in the service component.

State Education Department View: A variety of somewhat different components seem necessary for the successful transition from advanced programs to a professional role in a state education agency. Three facets of professional preparation which seem particularly important are: 1) skill in school staff development, 2) competence in program design and evaluation, and 3) leadership in developing educational policy.

The skills necessary for promoting successful staff development are not the same as those required for teacher training. Staff development is more typically a continuing education, tailored more for individual programs and teachers needs than is traditional teacher education. The politics of staff development are more complex. One is no longer working in the faculty-to-student relationship characteristic of most university-based teacher training. Thus, the professional involved in school staff development must allow for wider input in the decision making process. Current advanced programs provide little in the way of models for this professional role. Although it may be less than desired, most programs provide for more training for the professorial role than is provided for a staff developer role. A course of study focusing on administrative theory and educational leadership should provide a useful beginning, almost necessarily supplemented with field-based experiences in staff development.

A second facet of this professional role is program design and evaluation. The design factor also involves theoretical knowledge and practical experience. Knowledge of the reading process is necessary but not a sufficient condition for successful program design. The professional should be well versed in learning theory and instructional materials development. In addition, it seems that a background in classroom teaching is necessary to guide the design. Similarly, program evaluation is the forgotten sister of research design. While statistical theory and techniques are applicable and necessary, most often the procedures expounded in formal coursework relate more to experimental design than to program evaluation. Thus, the student is left not only lacking practicum experiences in applying theoretical principles, but is too often left without the theoretical bases for program evaluation.

Programs would do well to consider whether their course of study provides either theory or practice for the student who will be called upon to design and evaluate instructional programs.

A third facet of a state education agency is the development of educational policy. Here one may be called upon to create or shape policies concerning the right-to-read, life-long educational opportunities, bilingual education, education of persons with special needs or handicapping conditions. The one basic criticism of current advanced programs is that too often the student is exposed to a very narrow view of the world. The many hard issues involved in creating educational policy are seldom if ever discussed. Doctoral programs in reading seem to accept as a given that reading ability is both a necessary and fruitful goal of public education. In the real world this position may get widespread lip-service but budgetary and legislative matters intervene. Professionals in state education agencies typically exert more influence on policy decisions than do either university faculy or public school personnel, but most advanced programs in reading have no course of study equivalent to those found in a graduate school of public affairs. Current programs would be enhanced if some mechanisms were available to fill this void. Thus, from the point of view of state education agency personnel current programs should offer coursework concerned not only with an understanding of the reading processes but also coursework and practical experience in areas of staff development, program design and evaluation, and educational leadership in policy design. This would require a fairly massive restructuring of most current programs but many of the suggestions would improve the ability of the program graduates to effect change, regardless of whether they choose a position in a state education agency or not.

Public School View: A primary concern expressed from the view of public school personnel might be labelled a lack of preparation in dealing with the "real world". Again, it was stressed that the preparation needed to be "concretized", that knowledge of process was not sufficient but rather it is also necessary to be able to communicate the process and content in the classroom. Related to this is the fact that while many advanced programs require some sort of practicum with poor readers, this is typically a tutorial situation quite unlike the situation to be met in the public schools. Though graduates of doctoral programs in reading seldom work at the classroom level, most who accept positions in public shools are expected to be able to train personnel to function more effectively in such situations. Thus, an advanced program should be comprised of two components related to these roles: 1) successful instruction in classroom settings by the graduate, and 2) demonstration of the ability to work successfully with classroom teachers to improve their instructional effectiveness.

Additionally, the task demands of the public school role often involve administrative or supervisory activities. Whether these are budget development, generating proposals for external funding, evaluation of instructional personnel, etc. the task demands seem to suggest preparation in the form of coursework and practicum or internships.

The implications for current programs might basically be that of greater involvement with public schools. Advanced graduate students should have the opportunity to experience various public school environments, particularly if teaching experience is limited in either number of years of teaching experience, or a limited range of grade levels, or exposure to types of educational environments. Programs should provide opportunities for the study of administrative and organizational theory, as well as ensuring the instructional competence of graduates.

The Student View: Three words seemed to summarize the student point of view: relevance, participation, integration. While a number of the points already addressed could be reiterated at this time, the student role in advanced programs was seen as currently a bit denigrating. The typical advanced student is a professional with a variety of experiences, both academic and job related. Unfortunately, in too many programs the advanced student is not accorded the status of a professional, but is seen as a lackey to which menial tasks should be assigned. While not demanding consideration as equals nor asking for a peer relationship with faculty, advanced students are disturbed by second class citizenship.

A second point is closely related and concerns the student's role in program design. Since each student has personal professional aspirations, program design should be guided by faculty but adjusted to the individual. Constraints on program design are fine but should not force every student through the same design. Provision should be made for student input. Program design should be an educational endeavor, not a torturous proving ground.

A third factor relates to active involvement in integrating theory into practice. Whether it be teacher training, research, program evaluation, or whatever, provide "hands on" experiences prior to graduation. These experiences should be developed with faculty and not necessarily under faculty supervison. There is something qualitatively different about doing a course outline or research paper for someone and doing the same activities with someone. This relates back to the acceptance of students as professionals and is a key to the success of advanced graduate work. That is, whether a student works for someone or with someone. The latter is always more rewarding. Many of the skills necessary for any professional role are better learned from models than they are learned from either textbook study or lectures. The importance of theoretical bases should not be neglected but neither should these be considered sufficient. It is also necessary to provide opportunities to integrate and apply, opportunities that are structured and not simply hit or miss informal liasons.

Suggestions for current programs are first, to value your students more highly. Second, to provide flexibility in program design. Third, to provide access to models: researchers, teacher trainers, authors, etc.

Fourth, to provide guidance through close working relationships between faculty and students. Fifth, and finally, to develop more opportunities for participation in the professional role students select.

Summary: It seems that, as with most symposia, the limitations and weaknesses of the topic were more often addressed than the advantages and strengths. The message seems to be that the current state of the art in doctoral education in reading satisfies no one. The unfortunate conclusion, however, is that virtually everyone has different answers as to what the limitations are and how they might be corrected. However, two points seem recurrent: First, doctoral programs need to retain some flexibility for providing different experiences for the varied professional roles. A thorough understanding of the reading processes was about the only goal which all agreed upon. Second, structure more opportunities for active participation. Whether the role model calls for research, staff development, or teacher training, the consensus of opinion seems to be that participation, and experiences designed to integrate theory with practice is a necessary component of advanced graduate study.

Participants:

Chairman: Robert A. Palmatier, University of Georgia
Moderator: Richard Allington, State University of New York at Albany
University View: P. David Pearson, University of Minnesota
State Educ. Dept.: P. Jerry Hutchins, New York State Education Department
Public School View: Beatrice Levin, Philadelphia City Schools
Student View: Kay Gormley, State University of New York at Albany
Kemble Oliver, University of Georgia
Dennis Wright, Arizona State University

The virtues of being a toad and what that has to do with doctoral programs in reading

Kemble Oliver
University of Georgia

The following article is a transcript of the author's presentation at the Anaheim meeting. Richard Allington returned the text of the article with his lead article and suggested its publication as a separate article in this issue.

Many years ago Stephen Crane published a thin volume of poems called The Black Riders. One of the poems in that volume seemed particularly appropriate as an introduction to my remarks. The poem was untitled, so I'll simply call it the "Toad" poem. It goes something like this--with apologies to Crane for any changes in the original text since I quote from memory:

"Think as I think,"
said The Man,
"Or you are abominably wicked.
You are a toad."

And so I thought about it.
And then I said:
"I will then, be a Toad."

Both in the faculty at the University of Georgia, and among our graduate students there, we have a lot of toads.

I have a very high regard for toads.

My regard for toads makes the task with which I have been charged particularly difficult, however. Our assigned topic as panelists was what WE need from graduate training programs in reading. It is my assumption that the antecedents of the we in the title are the graduate students in reading at the University.

This means that I have to deal with the needs of more than twenty toads, each of whom came to the doctoral program with a different background of experience and with different reasons for seeking graduate training.

But it is just this disparity of interests and prior training which provides the key to what it is that is needed in our doctoral programs.

While competency-based programs are needed, too often they are developed with the idea that there is some basic set of competencies--standards if you will--to which every student needs to be subjected.

But doctoral students. And their professors. The good ones at least. Are Toads.

We have our own ideas about what we need from our doctoral training, and we have some idea of the roles we would like to be competent to assume upon graduation.

For the most part, however, our perceptions of what we need, and our perceptions of the roles in which we would like to become competent are rather global--we don't have clear ideas of exactly what we need or exactly what is required in the roles we expect to assume.

The kinds of in-depth counseling which many of us receive when we enter the doctoral program are good--they provide us with more specific information about what is required if we plan to go into research; if we want to publish; if we plan to work with teachers in preservice and inservice education; if we plan to assume leadership roles in school systems.

The counseling is good. The courses of study are reasonable. But they leave out what seem to me to be crucial elements in our education: Direct pre-graduation experiences and concrete, living models with whom we can identify and from whom we can learn.

Let's look at four broad areas of the doctoral program. First, the area of research. How many doctoral candidates are given the experience of engaging in research in cooperation with and under the direction of an accomplished researcher, prior to the development and publication of the doctoral dissertation?

In an article published 14 years ago, David Wilder pointed to the dearth of role-models of full-time reading researchers with whom graduate students could identify and from whom they could acquire the behavior patterns of a trained research specialist in reading.

According to a 1975 survey of faculty members conducted by Everett Ladd and Seymour Lipsett, only four percent of those questioned indicated research as a primary interest.

We get a great deal of practice reading and analyzing research done by others, but how many graduate students spend at least part

of their time in graduate training actually conducting research under the direction of a trained and accomplished research specialist in reading?

The second area might be broadly labeled the skills of publication. In this area I include both the writing of professional articles for publication and the development of instructional materials for commercial publishers.

How does the graduate student learn how to write for publication, how to prepare materials for acceptance by major periodicals or publishers?

The how to aspect of publication has been covered in a superb article by Lee Mountain in our last Epistle, one which I highly recommend to all of you here present.

Once again, however, we as graduate students need to have concrete role models with whom we can identify--professors who are engaged in writing for publication, who are willing to involve us, to share with us the ins and outs of publishing, who will provide us with both the advice and the example needed for becoming productive, publishing reading educators.

The third area is the most important of all, because it is the area in which most of us will spend the majority of our time and in which we will expend the greatest portion of our energies. It is also the area about which I will say the least.

In the area of preservice and inservice education of teachers, to what extent are students given the opportunity of working with teachers under the direct guidance of a number of different role models at different grade levels? I emphasize here a number of different role models, because each of the professors at Georgia is a Toad--no class is like another, and each of them has developed effective and quite different styles of teaching. Each of them conducts a class in a different way. Each of them has his or her own way of relating to teachers.

Knowledge of what to teach is quite a different matter from how to teach, how to develop the kinds of skills which are required if one is to be successful in the doing. And teaching a captive audience of graduate students is quite different from working with that untamed beast of thirty to fifty teachers who come to one's classes on their own or under duress after a full day of teaching. And the older the students with whom they work, the meaner the teachers tend to be.

My fourth and final area concerns the development of the skills that are required in working with school administrators--with the

bosses. This area includes skill in helping them to draft project proposals, to select materials, to evaluate a program of instruction and change it until it works.

It is this area that is least considered and often overlooked entirely in doctoral programs of reading. How many professors are actively involved in working with neighboring school systems, not just in inservice instruction but in helping systems and schools to plan effective programs of instruction in their schools? How many graduate students are provided the knowledge and the skills which would prepare them to assume leaderhip roles in school systems upon graduation? Are supervised internships regularly required of students who plan to play the school-system coordinator's role upon graduation? Are effective role models available?

I began my remarks by extolling the virtues of being a toad. I would like to end what I have had to say on the same note. I think that we graduate students, being toads ourselves, appreciate professors who believe that there is virtue in being a toad, and who are willing to develop graduate training programs which take into account the terrible diversity of backgrounds and expectations of the graduate students with whom they work and for whose futures they are at least partially responsible.

Highlights of Legislative and Certification Changes in Eighteen States: Another 18 States Report

Kemble Oliver
University of Georgia

When the miniscule staff of EPISTLE began its attempt to pull together changes in legislation and certification standards in reading in the several states in the fall of 1975, we were extremely dubious of the ultimate success of our efforts. To say that we were dubious is to understate our uncertainty by a factor of seven, plus or minus two.

That we are able to bring you the responses of another eighteen states in this issue, bringing the total number of states represented to thirty-six, is totally due to the efforts of those of you who have taken the time and made the effort to find out what was going on in your state and report that information to us. For this we are most grateful.

As we found in attempting to synthesize the information from our initial eighteen respondents, it is virtually impossible to make more than limited generalizations. Therefore, as before, we follow our brief comments with detailed commentary from each of our respondents.

First, however, we would like to list the names of those states who, as yet have not provided us with information about activities within their states, hoping by so doing that someone within those states will send us information so that we can provide the readers of EPISTLE with information on the remaining fourteen states.

STATES FROM WHOM WE HAVE RECEIVED NO INFORMATION:

The Northwest:

Idaho
Washington

The Midwest:

Minnesota
Nebraska

The Big Islands:

Hawaii

The Far North:

Alaska

The Southeast:

Kentucky
North Carolina
South Carolina
West Virginia

The Northeast:

Delaware
Maine
Massachusetts
Pennsylvania

In this issue, EPISTLE will attempt a synthesis and commentary on the information received from the following states, to be followed by a listing of the specifics provided us by our respondents. These states, by region, are as follows:

The Northwest:

- Oregon
- Montana
- Wyoming

The Southwest:

- Arizona
- Colorado
- New Mexico
- Utah

The Midwest:

- Iowa
- Michigan
- Oklahoma
- North Dakota
- South Dakota

The Southeast:

- Alabama
- Arkansas
- Mississippi

The Northeast:

- Connecticut
- New Hampshire
- Rhode Island

The generalizations which will be drawn in the remarks that follow are based upon the detailed commentaries of the respondents. Their validity must therefore rely upon the accuracy and completeness of the commentaries.

At least four of the states reporting appear to have no formal, state-level requirements in reading. These states are: (1) Alabama; (2) North Dakota; (3) Utah, and (4) Wyoming. In Alabama, the Committee on Revision of Standards is expected to make its formal recommendations to the State Superintendent in late summer of this year, recommendations which, if adopted, will require the availability of coursework in reading education for all teachers, at all levels of instruction. A policy committee is meeting in North Dakota and is expected to recommend state level requirements in reading, at least for elementary certification. The outcome of such a recommendation is a matter of debate. In Utah only the most minimal standards are in effect at state level, leaving to individual colleges the responsibility for ensuring quality preparation in reading of its teacher candidates. Given the political nature of our campuses, it is doubtful if an increase in the level of preparation in reading will occur in the absence of legislative change. Wyoming appears to have no reading requirements for certification at any level. A proposal for specialist certification in reading has been submitted.

In Oklahoma a ruling has been made that teachers must have at least one course in learning disabilities for certification (and one in media). In Georgia such an action by the legislature in early 1976 has resulted in enormous classes, composed of teachers and administrators attempting to satisfy the legislative edict for certification and recertification, a number of whom would have been expected to enroll in summer classes in reading education. From Montana comes the report that learning disabilities specialists are given preference to reading specialist in school hiring. Both Connecticut and Iowa, however, are considering requiring coursework in reading of their disability specialists.

Five states (Arkansas, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and South Dakota) have recently passed legislation which, for the first time, provides for certification of reading specialists. In both Michigan and Wyoming proposals providing for such recognition have been submitted. In our earlier article we noted that the recognition of reading specialists seemed to percede later legislation requiring improved training in reading for all teachers, beginning with elementary and early childhood teachers and ultimately moving into the content areas. Hopefully, this will be the case in these states.

In three states, while no concrete action has been taken, resolutions have been submitted which may result in more rigorous preparation in reading for certification. Alabama expects to require ten to fifteen hours of preparation for early childhood (K-4) and middle school (5-8) teachers, and five hours of preparation for secondary (9-12) teachers. If approved, reading courses will have to undergo considerable expansion in that state. Arkansas anticipates requiring an additional course in reading for its elementary teachers. Montana expects its English teachers to be required to take at least one course in reading methods prior to certification.

Four states appear to have taken firm and substantive measures to upgrade reading education. In Arizona all elementary and special education teachers will be required to take at least four courses in reading education, with all secondary teachers being required to take at least two courses. New Mexico is requiring its elementary teachers to take six hours of preparation in reading; its secondary teachers will be required to take at least three hours of preparation. South Dakota has recently passed requirements of three hours in reading for its elementary teachers and at least three hours for its secondary teachers. In all four states, some expansion of reading faculty will undoubtably occur.

Oregon would appear to be unique among our eighteen states in taking the competency route toward certification of its teachers, with a resultant increase in the amount of time professors must spend in the

field supervising student candidates. In comparison with Oregon, William J. Oehlkers notes that "the competency based certification approach died a sudden death in Rhode Island after virtually unanimous opposition from various segments of the educational profession. The chief criticism of the approach was that the appropriate teacher behaviors have not been agreed upon and that valid measurement of those behaviors at this stage of the game was highly questionable."

Further commentary would appear to be superfluous at this point. In our earlier article we noted what appeared to be a growing awareness throughout the country of the need for more rigorous preparation of teachers in the area of reading, and we noted a growing tendency to require preparation in reading of secondary and content area teachers. The ogre of learning disabilities teachers driving reading professionals from the market-place appears a problem in only a limited number of states, in fact in many places the learning disabilities teachers are being required to take reading courses.

It appears at this point that the reading profession is facing a major challenge: We must demonstrate that our reading education courses will result in better instruction <u>for</u> and better reading <u>by</u> the students in our country. Or else.

ALABAMA — Terry C. Ley

The Committee on Revision of Standards for Teacher Education and Certification in Alabama hopes to be prepared to make its recommendations regarding preparation in reading instruction to the State Superintendent of Education by late summer, 1976. The committee's recommendations are expected to have implications for teachers at all grade levels.

The state presently requires no formal preparation in reading for its elementary or secondary school teachers. The committee is considering recommendations which would specify areas and levels of competence in reading instruction for each of three types of certificates (e.g., Early Childhood (K-4), 10 to 15 quarter hours; Middle School (5-8), 10 to 15 quarter hours; Secondary (9-12), five quarter hours for all content areas).

ARIZONA — Robert J. Tierney

The Arizona State Board of Education has mandated various revisions in the basic requirements for elementary, secondary, and special education certification:

. After September 1, 1976, all persons seeking elementary certification must have completed four reading education courses.

. After October 1, 1976, all persons seeking secondary certification must have completed two reading courses, one of which must be a supervised practicum.

. After October 1, 1976, basic special education certification will require four reading education courses, oriented to the needs of the special education teacher.

Compliance with these mandates has required the three universities within Arizona to undertake the restructuring of their reading education courses and program. To cope with the expanded course requirements, there has been and will be additions to reading education faculty.

In January, 1976, the Arizona State Board of Education introduced the requirement that a student's promotion from year to year be based upon predetermined standards for basic skills, including reading. Prior to graduation from high school, a student must demonstrate the ability to read at a ninth grade proficiency level, as determined by each local school district. Prior to receipt of an eight grade promotion certificate, each student must attain at least a sixth grade proficiency in reading.

ARKANSAS — Burton Crosswait

The state is reviewing certification requirements with the purpose of revising them. Requiring a reading methods course for secondary certification has been suggested. There is some sentiment that elementary teachers should be required to take two reading education courses, rather than the one currently required.

Since September, 1972, the following certification requirements in reading have been in effect:

. Elementary: one course;

. Secondary: no requirement;

. Reading teacher: elementary or secondary certification, plus a minimum of nine semester hours in reading;

. Reading specialist: a master's degree, plus a minimum of 12 semester hours of graduate coursework in reading.

COLORADO — Otto G. Ruff

There is a movement afoot in Colorado to require at least one course in reading for every teacher prior to regular certification or recertification at either the elementary or secondary school level. There is no way to predict the outcome.

Colorado has had teacher certification as follows: (1) Elementary reading teacher; (2) Secondary reading teacher, and (3) K-12 Reading specialist. Upon completion of a master's degree program with special emphasis in reading, a teacher's certificate may be further endorsed to reflect that specialization. The K-12 specialist certificate requires completion of a sixth-year program in reading.

No reading endorsements are available on undergraduate programs, nor for graduate minor specializations.

CONNECTICUT — John Percosolido

State department and reading education personnel are investigating the requirement of reading course requirements for learning disability certification.

In July, 1972, a course in reading and a course in adolescent literature became a requirement for certification in English. Reading consultant certification remains the same, requiring 18 semester hours of graduate coursework.

IOWA — Jack Bagford

The Advisory Committee to the State Right-to-Read Program is analyzing reading certification needs for the state and plans to make recommendations for future certification changes. These will undoubtably be addressed along the following lines:

- More rigorous enforcement of current certification requirements;
- Requiring some course work in reading of learning disabilities teachers;
- Requiring a minimum of two courses in reading for all elementary teachers;
- Requiring at least one course in the teaching of reading of all secondary teachers.

At present there are two reading certificates and one reading approval area available. The requirements are as follows:

- Reading teacher: 20 hours of approved college credit in reading;
- Reading clinician: Completion of a master's degree, plus two years of teaching experience;
- Reading specialist: Completion of a master's degree, plus four years of teaching experience.

All three of the preceding were developed along the guidelines suggested by the International Reading Association.

MICHIGAN — Charles Peters

Currently, different professional organizations are working with the State Department of Education to develop certification standards. One recommendation under consideration advocates three different categories, divided into two levels (elementary and secondary): (1) reading teacher; (2) reading specialist (clinician, consultant, remedial specialist); (3) reading supervisor.

Unlike many of the states that presented a summary of their certification requirements in the last issue of EPISTLE, Michigan virtually lacks any standards for reading certification. The only "standards" that exist are attached to reading support aid that is dispensed through Section 43 of the School Aid Act. To be eligible for these funds, the teacher needs only a minimum of six hours in remediation and diagnosis and an additional six hours in reading-related courses. As a result of such dismal standards, qualified reading teachers are having difficulty finding jobs, because it is sometimes financially more advantageous for an administrator to hire the least qualified person. It is not uncommon to find a teacher with no formal training in reading serving as a reading consultant, while a teacher with a master's degree in reading is either unable to find a job at all or able to find a job--but not in reading.

MISSISSIPPI — George McNinch

Certification in reading at the graduate level continues to operate under a detailed plan set forth by the State Department of Education in 1970. Certification at each of two levels both require a minimum of two years of teaching experience. The Class A Teacher Permit (1-12) requires completion of 12 semester of 16 quarter hours of credit; The Class AA Reading Teacher Permit (1-12) requires 15 and 20 hours of credit, respectively.

(No indication was given of requirements in reading for certification in elementary or secondary fields.)

MONTANA — Hap Gilliland

There have been no changes in certification requirements in Montana.

However, many schools which in the past hired reading teachers are now hiring learning disabilities specialists instead.

There is under consideration a change which will require a reading course for certification in English. It is not certain yet whether this will pass. It is a possibility.

NEW HAMPSHIRE — John J. Carney

At the present time there is a movement toward requiring coursework in reading for secondary certification in all content areas.

The State of New Hampshire recently provided for certification for specialists in reading, upon completion of an approved graduate program.

Finally, the New Hampshire School Administrator's Association has passed a resolution recommending to the State Standards Board that "effective June 30, 1978, elementary candidates not having a minimum of 12 hours in reading will no longer be recommended for employment in New Hampshire elementary schools." Present standards do not specify requirements in terms of hours.

NEW MEXICO — Charles C. Bomont

In January, 1976, the State Board of Education approved sweeping new teacher certification requirements, requirements which met the recommendations included in the New Mexico IRA resolution of 1974. Briefly, these requirements are as follows:

- Elementary teachers: six semester hours of reading required;
- Secondary teachers: three semester hours of reading in the content areas required;
- By July, 1980, all teachers in New Mexico must have met the above requirements.

A new committee, the Committee of Higher Education in Reading, has been formed to identify behaviors classroom teachers should exhibit. When these behaviors have been identified, the committee will use them as a guideline for developing university coursework to enable teacher trainees to exhibit the behaviors.

New requirements have been adopted for the elementary and secondary reading endorsements:

- Elementary reading endorsement: Elementary certification, plus 24 semester hours, a minimum of 18 of which must be in reading;
- Secondary reading endorsement: Secondary certification, plus 24 semester hours, a minimum of 21 of which must be in reading.

Requirements for a reading specialist certificate include both a master's degree with a reading endorsement and a sixth year planned program in reading education. Furthermore, any person presently serving as a reading specialist must remove any deficiencies at the rate of eight semester hours per year. Requirements are to become effective for the 1980-1981 school year.

NORTH DAKOTA — Joe Peterson

There are, at present, no state requirements in reading. The responsibility for determining whether teachers are adequately trained in reading education is vested in colleges of teacher education in the state. A state advisory council on reading is in the midst of deliberations to advise the state Right-to-Read Committee on ways of improving preparation in reading education. The possibility of a two-course sequence in reading as a requirement for certification is still in the talking stage.

OKLAHOMA — Charles L. Smith

In Oklahoma, the only changes are those which affect standards for all new standard state teaching certificates. Effective July 1, 1976, one course in media and one course in teaching the exceptional child will be required. Other situations remain static as far as reading is concerned.

OREGON — Kenneth M. Ahrendt

The State Department of Public Instruction requires the following preparation for elementary and secondary education majors:

- Elementary teachers: Six quarter hours in reading methods, plus 15 hours of supervised teaching of reading in the field;
- Secondary teachers: Three quarter hours in reading methods prior to student teaching and for certification. Secondary school teachers must have an additional course in reading instruction at graduate level when they obtain their standard teaching certificate.

Effective January 1, 1976, the Teachers Standards and Practices Commission adopted new regulations for the endorsement of reading teachers in the State of Oregon. The Basic endorsement requires competencies in the following areas: (1) language and communication; (2) foundations of reading instruction; (3) instructional materials and media; (4) management competencies including classroom, resource center, and support personnel; (5) knowledge of the learner with reading difficulties; diagnosis and correction. The endorsement is K-12 in scope.

Standard endorsement in reading requires additional demonstrated competencies or 18 additional quarter hours to include curriculum development and administrative procedures.

The impact of the above requirements has forced additional, on-site supervision of students engaged in practicum experiences. At present, the universities are using masters and doctoral level candidates to assist in supervising field experiences.

RHODE ISLAND — William J. Oehlkers

For many years no certification standards existed in Rhode Island. This is no longer the case. Effective August 1, 1976, a complete set of standards will go into effect. Two certificates will be offered:

- Reading specialist (Primary responsibility to teach reading): Requires 18 hours in reading at the provisional level and a master's degree, plus six additional hours in reading at professional level;

- Reading consultant (Primary responsibility to administer reading programs): Requirements include the holding of the specialist degree, have completed courses in reading administration and research, and have experience as a reading teacher. At the professional level of certification, 15 hours in reading and reading-related courses are required.

All certificates in Rhode Island are K-12 in scope. (No information was provided about required courses in reading education for elementary or secondary classroom teachers.)

SOUTH DAKOTA — Cecil Kipling, Jr.

In January, 1976, the State Board of Education adopted regulations which will have a long range effect on reading in the state. Effective July 1, 1978, all secondary and elementary teachers must have a three-semester hour course in reading for certification.

Effective July 1, 1976, an endorsement for the Reading Specialist certificate will become available. Requirements for the degree will include three years of teaching experience, plus twelve graduate hours in reading. This is the first time that the reading specialist has been recognized by the State Board of Education.

The implications of the actions taken by the State Board will mean additional courses, especially in secondary reading, will have to be developed and included in course offerings in the state universities.

UTAH — Blaine H. Moore

The state of Utah requires two semester hours of reading and language arts for undergraduate certification. Certification, however, is determined by agreement between the certifying institution and the university responsible for teacher preparation; there would therefore be some variation in what is actually required for approval for the certificate issued from institution to institution.

At graduate level, certification is determined by area of specialization, with graduate students being required to pick up a certain amount of course hours in the elementary curriculum area. A graduate student may select all of his hours from one curriculum area.

(From the summary provided, there would seem to be no particular notice taken of reading as a primary certification area in Utah.)

WYOMING — Edward Paradis

At the present time Wyoming does not require a reading course for certification in any area, at any level. Some consideration is presently being given to require at least one reading course for certification at the middle school level.

An endorsement in remedial reading may be obtained by successfully completing six semester hours of reading courses.

A proposal has been submitted which would provide for certification as an elementary reading teacher, a secondary reading teacher, or as a reading consultant. The following requirements have been suggested:

- Elementary or secondary reading teachers: Two years of teaching experience, plus 18 semester hours of reading courses, including a practicum;
- Reading consultant: Three years of teaching experience, 24 hours of reading courses, and a master's degree in education.

JOB REPORT

The following positions have been reported to the EPISTLE editors. Those interested in specific positions should communicate directly with the contact person listed.

* * * * * *

CONNECTICUT

Institution: Eastern Connecticut State College

Position: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate preferred

Experience Desired: Experience as a reading consultant to public schools and experience in reading clinic. Evidence of appropriate supervisory experience at the pre-school and elementary level.

Contact Person: Dr. Robert W. Dolph

Address: Eastern Connecticut State College
Committee for New Faculty
Willimantic, Connecticut 06226

Telephone: (203) 456-2231 Ext. 502

* * * * * *

DELAWARE

Institution: University of Delaware

Position: Assistant or Associate Professor (Clinical Emphasis)

Degree Required: Doctorate with a major in Reading

Responsibilities: Teach introductory and advanced graduate courses for master's and doctorate students; supervise an established reading clinic program.

Experience Desired: Teaching experience at the college level as a faculty member or graduate assistant; experience in dealing with reading in multi-cultural and urban settings.

Contact Person: Dr. John J. Pikulski

Address: The Reading Study Center
College of Education
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

* * * * * *

Institution: University of Delaware

Position: Assistant Professor of Education

Degree Required: Doctorate major in Reading with work in Language Arts

Responsibilities: Teach graduate courses; teach undergraduate courses and provide leadership in teaching preparation in reading at the elementary level.

Experience Desired: Teaching experience at the elementary level; demonstrated ability to work in multi-cultural and urban settings.

Contact Person: Dr. John J. Pikulski

Address: The Reading Study Center
College of Education
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

* * * * * *

GEORGIA

Institution: The Fort Valley State College

Position: The Teaching of Reading course--or reading specialist

Degree Required: Doctorate

Responsibilities: Methods in the Teaching of Reading and Language Arts for elementary and early childhood education majors.

Experience Desired: Elementary teaching experience preferred; competence in areas of teaching responsibilities--especially Reading, Language Arts, Language Development.

Contact Person: Dr. Doris H. Adams, Chairman

Address: Division of Education
The Fort Valley State College
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030

Starting Date: September 1976

* * * * * *

LOUISIANA

Institution: Louisiana College

Position: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Responsibilities: Teaching undergraduate level reading courses and elementary methods courses; establishment and supervision of an on-campus reading clinic.

Experience Desired: Recent and successful experience as an elementary school teacher.

Contact Person: Dr. Thomas W. Kelly, Chairman

Address: Department of Education
Louisiana College
Pineville, Louisiana 71360

Telephone: (318) 487-7303

Starting Date: January 1977

* * * * * *

MICHIGAN

Institution: Oakland Schools

Position: Consultant - Secondary Reading

Degree Required: Doctorate

Responsibilities: To work with teachers, administrators, board members, peers, university or state education department personnel.

Experience Desired: Taught secondary school; must be able to view master contract or economic constraints as constraints not barriers.

Contact Person: Dr. Roy J. Butz, Director

Address: Reading and Language Center
Oakland Schools
2100 Pontiac Lake Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48054

Starting Date: September 1976

* * * * * *

OHIO

Institution: John Carroll University

Position: Assistant Professor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Responsibilities: Reading and supervision of elementary clinical and laboratory experience.

Experience Desired: Recent experience in working with the elementary school child and elementary school teachers.

Contact Person: Dr. Raymond A. LeGrand, Chairman

Address: Department of Education
John Carroll University
University Heights
Cleveland, Ohio 44118

* * * * * *

Institution: Ohio University

Position: Reading and Language Arts - Assistant Profesor

Degree Required: Doctorate

Responsibilities: Teaching undergraduate and/or graduate courses in Reading and Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Problems, and assisting in Reading Clinic.

Experience Desired: Teaching or Reading Clinic experience.

Contact Person: Dr. Albert G. Leep

Address: College of Education
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Telephone: (614) 594-8961

Starting Date: September 1976

time capsule

- Anaheim, California again hosted the International Reading Association's Annual Convention. Parking lot walking was a major participant activity. Meetings were of good quality in good facilities, but they were so isolated from hotels and entertainment. New York also demanded extensive hiking but it offered a atmosphere other than parking lots. However, much of the barren atmosphere was overcome by the night at Disneyland.

- Texas joins the small group of states making EPISTLE aware of an organized group for college professors of reading. Michael Strange, a first year resident, informs us that Don Critchlow is the current president of the Texas Association of Professors of Reading. No response has been received to a query concerning other officers and the groups activities.

- Since grass roots organizations for college professors of reading seem to be few, you may wish to begin working toward such an organization in your state. This seems to be an effective way to begin to interact with decision making groups concerning programs, certification, funding, and other aspects affecting the nature of the college professors job. Interaction is far better than reaction, usually when the time for changing a decision is already past. EPISTLE will be happy to put you in touch with individuals who are involved in successful state organizations of college professors of reading.

- As we all move in the direction of competency and performance based teacher education you may wish to know how others are doing it. Paul Gallagher, Florida International University; Rita Richey and Fred Cook, Wayne State University; and Joe Lars Klingstedt and Stanely Ball, University of Texas at El Paso have prepared a monograph entitled, Technical Assistance Paper No. 2: Profiling and Tracking Students in C/PBTE Programs. Copies are available for $2.50 each from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C. 20036.

- And finally for those who may have forgotten, this is the Summer of the gigantic fourth of July celebrating 200 years of democracy, USA style!!

--Bob Palmatier

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Richard Allington teaches graduate reading courses, including a clinical practicum in diagnosis and remediation, at the State University of New York at Albany. He is a past winner of an IRA distinguished dissertation award (Ph.D. Michigan State University, 1973), and is working as co-author on a book on secondary reading.

Kemble Oliver is a graduate student working toward a doctorate in reading education at the University of Georgia. From 1970 through 1973 he served as state reading consultant with the Department of Public Instruction in North Carolina. From 1973 through 1975 he served as project coordinator of a school-based Right-to-Read project in Salisbury, North Carolina. On July 1, 1976, he was hired as reading coordinator with the Clarke County School District in Athens, Georgia. For the past year he has served as assistant editor to EPISTLE.

next issue ...

Copy Deadline - September 1, 1976